## **REMARKS**

At least the following claimed elements are not taught by the cited Soane reference:

- (1) "...the negatively charged particles to focus in the first channel in one direction, the positively charged particles to focus in the first channel in the opposite direction;"
- (2) "...negatively charged particles to migrate through a sieve disposed in one second channel in said device ... both of said second channels <u>transverse to said first channel</u>;" and
- (3) "...negatively charged particles to migrate through a <u>sieve</u> disposed in one second channel ...." (Emphasis added).

With respect to the first item, there is no suggestion that both positive and negative particles would ever be placed within the system of Soane. The mere mention that different things could be done, depending on the polarity of the particles, does not teach specifically what is claimed. Moreover, it does not teach handling both positive and negative particles in the way claimed. Specifically, nothing teaches focusing the differently charged particles in opposite directions along a first channel. Therefore, reconsideration is requested.

With respect to the second item, Soane does not divert the particles in his main channel 22 to any of the secondary channels 24, 26, or 28. To the contrary, he <u>supplies</u> reactants <u>from the secondary channels</u> 24, 26, and 28 to the main channel. See column 9, lines 42-43, "...a reactant may be introduced into the entry port 40 ...." Thus, reactant flows in at 40 through the channel 24 into the main channel 22 and to the reaction site 30. Thus, there is no provision of signals to cause different polarity particles to go to different transverse channels, but, instead, the opposite effect is taking place. Therefore, reconsideration is requested.

With respect to the third item, it is claimed that the focused positively charged particles migrate through the sieve disposed in a second channel. There is no attempt to address the claimed sieve or its use as claimed and there appears to be no basis to suggest that the reference teaches such a thing.

For at least the above-referenced reasons, reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 7, 2007

Timothy M. Trop, Reg. No. 28,994 TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.

1616 S. Voss Road, Suite 750

Houston, TX 77057 713/468-8880 [Phone] 713/468-8883 [Fax]

Attorneys for Intel Corporation